

SUBJECT No. 14.

A regulation to prevent adulteration of foodstuffs.

Messrs. C. Vaman Rao and N. Subba Rao, Nagar Taluk; T. Venkataappa, Shimoga Taluk; Chikramanna, Byre Gowda and Dodda Vembraliah, Kolar Taluk; and K. Krishnamurti Rao, Magadi Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—As the adulteration of foodstuffs is on the increase from day to day, a regulation to prevent fraud may be passed early. Public health is of paramount importance and the necessary restrictions, even though irksome, should be imposed.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 15.

Amendment of Court Fees Regulation.

Mr. V. Raghavachar, Mysore Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Court fees in cases connected with disputes about lands in *inam* villages, are calculated either on the value of such lands or fifteen times the yield of such lands in the year previous to the suit; while in such cases in Government villages, court fees are calculated at five times the assessment. As there seems to be no reason for such a distinction, the existing law may be amended.

The amendment is necessary at least in suits between two tenants under the same *inamdār*, if not, as between tenant and *inamdār*. In the case of unsettled villages the assessment may be estimated.

Reply of Government.—There are many practical difficulties in carrying out the suggestion. If, however, the member will be good enough to send up detailed proposals in the shape of a draft bill, the matter can be considered.

SUBJECT No. 16.

Amendment of Court Fees Regulation.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—1. When a suit is filed for the recovery of a land which forms (i) an entire survey number or a definite share of such survey number, or (ii) a portion of a survey number separately assessed in Government accounts, the value of such lands for the purpose of court fees is ruled to be five times the assessment payable on such land or definite share.

2. Government Notification No. J. 2951, dated 25th March 1908, the wordings of which closely follow those of the Notification No. J. 4328, dated 10th September 1894, says that when a suit is filed to recover a fractional share of a land mentioned above in (ii), the value of the land for the purpose of the computation of court fees shall not exceed five times the revenue rateably payable in respect of the share.

3. The words 'fractional share' in the above notification have been interpreted by the Allahabad High Court (16 All. 493) as applying only to a definite or fractional share and not to a specified portion. This interpretation is followed in some courts in the State. This is clearly a hardship involving at the same time an anomaly of valuing a land when a fractional share (not a specified portion which also forms a fraction of the whole) is claimed at five times the proportionate assessment payable on such portion and when the same fractional share which has